

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT FUNDS WORKING GROUP

Wednesday, May 29, 2002 – 1:30 p.m.
MAG Office Building, Suite 200 - Saguaro Room
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS PRESENT

Councilman Greg Stanton, Co-Chair, Phoenix	Reed Kempton, Maricopa County, representing the MAG Pedestrian Working Group
Mike Hutchinson, Co-Chair, Mesa, representing the MAG Management Committee	Andre Licardi, representing the Arizona Commission of the Arts
*Grant Anderson, Goodyear, representing the MAG Street Committee	Mary O'Connor, Tempe, representing the MAG Regional Bicycle Task Force
Angela Dye, representing the American Society of Landscape Architects Arizona Chapter	Doug Kupel, representing Archaeological and Historic Preservation (Arizona Preservation Foundation)
Marcie Ellis, representing the West Valley Fine Arts Council	

*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT

Rose Arck, Camelback East Village Committee	Katie Gregory, Peoria
Glenn Fahringer, Cave Creek	Kirk Haines, Peoria
Jeff Low, Cave Creek	Chris Ewell, Phoenix
Mike Normand, Chandler	Tom Fitzgerald, Phoenix
Greg Westrum, Chandler	John Siefert, Phoenix
Claudia Whitehead, Chandler	Lynn Timmons, Phoenix
Councilmember Tom Eggleston, Glendale	Sharon Wood, Phoenix
Paula Moloff, Glendale	Miryam Gutier, Surprise
Antonio Figueroa, Guadalupe	Daniel Newell, Surprise
Dawn M. Coomer, MAG	Gary Davis, Tempe
Dora Vasquez, Maricopa County DOT	Eric Iwersen, Tempe
Cindy Heard, Mesa	Elizabeth Thomas, Tempe
Ken Ventura, Mesa	Priscilla Hanrahan, Valley Metro/RPTA

1. Call to Order

Co-Chair Stanton called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

2. Approval of the March 20, 2002 Meeting Minutes of the Enhancement Funds Working Group

Angela Dye noted a change to the meeting minutes. On page four, the national organization is doing the white paper, not the Arizona Chapter. Andre Licardi moved to approve the March 20, 2002 meeting minutes of the Enhancement Funds Working Group. Angela Dye seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

3. Introduction of Working Group Members and Members of the Audience

Members of the Working Group and the audience introduced themselves.

4. Update on the Enhancement Funds Process

Dawn Coomer addressed the Working Group and the audience. She explained the role of the Enhancement Funds Working Group (EFWG). Appointed in 1993, the members represent the eligible areas of the transportation enhancements legislation. The EFWG evaluates and recommends projects to the MAG Regional Council. The EFWG is co-chaired by a member of the Management Committee. All meetings are open to the public and the public is encouraged to attend the meetings.

The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, or TEA-21, is the federal law for transportation. The law requires that each state set aside 10 percent of its Surface Transportation Program funds for Transportation Enhancements (TE). TE activities enhance the surface transportation system with projects that go above and beyond what transportation departments typically do. TE rules vary from state to state since each Department of Transportation establishes rules for the TE program. Projects are classified as either “local” or “state” in the project. “Local” projects are on locally-owned right-of-way, and “state” projects are on state-owned right-of-way.

This round, there is \$7.5 million available for local projects and \$5.5 million for state projects. Scheduled items include a review of TE applications at today’s meeting, additional review and ranking at an EFWG meeting on June 10, and a tentative meeting to be held if needed on June 24th. The Management Committee and Regional Council will consider the EFWG’s recommendations in July, and applications are due to the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) by September 6, 2002. The state evaluation committee, the Transportation Enhancements Review Committee, or TERC for short, is scheduled to meet for three days in October to recommend projects from the entire state. The State Transportation Board must approve all the projects, and that should happen in November, 2002.

This year, we received 16 local projects totaling over six million dollars by the May 13, 2002 deadline. Three state projects were received totaling approximately \$1.7 million. The Regional Bicycle Task Force and Pedestrian Working Group have reviewed and provided comment on

bicycle and pedestrian related applications. These comments have been provided to applicants and the EFWG for consideration at their meeting today.

The EFWG reviews and ranks all projects submitted from the MAG region. The top ranked applications equal to the amount of funding available are forwarded to ADOT for additional consideration. This year, we can forward all the projects to ADOT, if the EFWG chooses, since the amount of projects submitted don't exceed the amount of funding available.

The EFWG also recommends changes to applications to improve their quality and likelihood of funding, and communicates concerns to ADOT about the TE process. Finally, the EFWG serves to rank projects based on their merit and strength. While the majority of members on the EFWG work for MAG member agencies, members are accountable to the committees they represent on the EFWG, such as the Regional Bicycle Task Force and Street Committee, rather than the jurisdiction they work for. Members of the EFWG are strongly encouraged to obtain input from and report their results to the modal committees they represent.

Ms. Coomer explained several changes to the process this year that have been initiated by ADOT. This year, a support letter from the project sponsor and a council resolution is required for all projects, both local and state projects. State project applications require both a District Engineer signature as the project sponsor, and a support letter. In addition, much more detail is required in the cost estimate of the project application. Non-construction projects, such as bicycle or pedestrian education projects, require an environmental clearance. Construction projects require utility, right-of-way and environmental clearances. Projects using federal funds for design cannot go beyond the 30 percent design stage without obtaining an environmental clearance.

The EFWG has three meetings each year: the first to review applications, the second to review and rank applications, and a tentative meeting for additional review and ranking if needed. The agenda for the review meeting lists the order in which applications are heard. Applications are first introduced by MAG staff. Then, a brief three minute presentation is given by the sponsor of the application. This presentation is followed by a public comment period of a maximum of five total minutes. Then, there is a 10 minute question-and-answer session led by the Co-Chairs of the EFWG.

Applicants are required to submit a written response to EFWG comments raised during today's review meeting. These comments should be submitted to MAG staff. Public comment at the ranking meeting will be limited to a general public comment period at the beginning of the meeting, with a limit of 10 total minutes.

There were six projects funded last year with transportation enhancements: 4 local projects and 2 state projects. The local projects were in Goodyear, Phoenix, Avondale and Gilbert. State projects were in Phoenix and Wickenburg. There were several projects not funded last year by the TERC, including projects in Chandler, Gilbert, Glendale, Litchfield Park, Phoenix, Scottsdale and Surprise. RPTA and MAG projects were also not funded last year.

Given the new process for this round, Mary O'Connor asked if written questions could be forwarded to applicants if there was insufficient time to discuss the applications. Ms. Coomer said that they could. Angela Dye added that the EFWG had met in March of this year to discuss the process changes to improve the process for this round of transportation enhancements.

5. Call to the Audience

No members of the audience wished to address the Working Group.

6. Review and Discussion of Round X Enhancement Fund Applications

Co-Chair Stanton explained that the purpose of this process is to improve the quality of the applications. Applicants should not become discouraged at any of the comments or issues raised by Working Group members. These applications are forwarded to the Arizona Department of Transportation and compete with other projects from throughout the state. He noted that Dawn Coomer would provide a brief introduction of all the applications, noting any significant issues.

Surprise: Grand Avenue (SR 60)

Ms. Coomer described the application and issues raised thus far, including:

- Does Surprise wish to submit a ranking of its projects to the Enhancement Funds Working Group?
- A council resolution (in addition to the letter of support from the Mayor) will be needed prior to submitting the applications to ADOT (due to MAG by 8/30).

Daniel Newell addressed the Working Group, noting that the Bell Road project is a higher priority for Surprise. The Grand Avenue project was submitted last year but did not receive funding. The requested funds will address the first phase of the project. Grand Avenue has numerous users and is a principal arterial in Surprise. There is currently no landscaping in most areas. The funds will improve the aesthetics of the area and help reduce dust in the medians. There is a significant match provided by Surprise in this project, and all ADOT requirements will be met as needed.

Questions from the Working Group were deferred until a description of the next Surprise project.

Surprise: Bell Road

Mr. Newell described this project, which is similar in scope to the Grand Avenue project. The city has partially completed a design for this project.

Mary O'Connor asked if there were sidewalks on Bell Road and Grand Avenue. If not, adding sidewalks to these applications would strengthen them and should be considered. Mr. Newell noted that along Grand Avenue, there are sidewalks on the west side. These were provided by a developer and are four to six feet in width, and meander. There are no sidewalks on the east side along Grand Avenue, and they are not currently included in the project. On Bell Road, there are sidewalks on the south side. A walkway on the north side of Bell Road is not feasible due to the presence of a flood structure.

Ms. O'Connor asked if bicycle facilities were planned for Bell Road. Mr. Newell noted that they were not planned, given the unsafe conditions posed by narrow right-of-way and high travel speeds. Angela Dye stated that both of these projects need to include bicycle facilities and pedestrian walkways. There is space for an off-street pathway, and this was a recommendation in a recent study being completed for Grand Avenue. Mr. Newell added that the roadways are posted at 40 to 45 miles per hour and are narrow. He noted that Surprise wishes to focus on landscaping and lighting as a first step. Ms. O'Connor said that these speeds do not make bicycle and pedestrian travel unsafe, and that the MAG Bicycle Task Force and Pedestrian Working Group could provide some guidance on providing safe facilities. In order to rank higher, these projects will need to have a pedestrian element. Mr. Newell responded that pedestrian facilities can be added to Bell Road. The addition of bicycle lanes would require right-of-way, which is probably not feasible. Sidewalks on the west side of Grand Avenue are also possible.

Reed Kempton noted that most bicycle lanes in the region are on roadways with posted speed limits of 40 to 45 miles per hour. Doug Kupel stated that the application should also show a quantity for the irrigation in the cost estimate.

Phoenix: Camelback Core Pedestrian Enhancement Project

Ms. Coomer provided a summary of key project issues. She noted that a letter of support has been received along with a Council resolution. Other issues include:

- Phoenix indicates this as their highest priority of two projects submitted.
- This project has been submitted for the third time this year, and was the highest ranked local project by the EFWG last year.
- An issue last year with this project was integration with the planned bicycle/pedestrian bridge at 22nd Street and Camelback. This relationship could be explained in the application.
- Match is too low.

John Siefert addressed the Working Group. This project is a critical element of the pedestrian spine, which was developed in a study sponsored by MAG. The Bridge is at 25th Street, not 22nd Street. This project will retrofit two intersections along Camelback Road at 20th and 24th Streets.

The project will make the pedestrian queuing areas larger, use decorative paving that meets ADA guidelines, shading, countdown pedestrian indicators, and a gateway at the intersection of 24th Street and Camelback.

Rose Arck of the Camelback East Village Committee addressed the Working Group. The Biltmore Area Partnership and the Camelback East Village Planning Committee is very supportive of this project. This area needs to work for pedestrians and not just for vehicles. The pedestrian spine signage and pavers are now included in development agreements. This project will improve the safety in this area. The Village Committee is also working with the owners of the Esplanade to incorporate the pedestrian spine concept into their work. The neighbors are very supportive of the bridge.

Mary O'Connor noted several issues to address in the project design. The project will need to meet new ADA guidelines: a 48 inch clear area is needed that doesn't have a surface treatment; intersection curb ramps should be directional to assist persons with mobility challenges move through the intersection; and the pedestrian countdown signal should have an audible component. Ms. O'Connor asked about the sidewalk width on 20th and 24th Streets. Is there a way to improve the sidewalk widths on those roads in this project? The sidewalk needs to be 6 feet wide to meet ADA.

Mr. Siefert said that the new city standard is for 6 foot sidewalks if they are next to the curb, and for five feet if off-set from the curb. In high use areas, sidewalks are generally eight to 10 feet. Ms. O'Connor asked if bikes are allowed on 24th Street. Mr. Siefert said that there are bicycle lanes of nearby streets, including Campbell and 36th Street. The intersection of 24th Street and Camelback cannot be improved to accommodate bike lanes. Ms. O'Connor that a 10 foot sidewalk may be a better option to allow some bicyclist movement, although this is not the best alternative.

Reed Kempton asked if the median could be narrowed. It appears to be approximately 40 feet wide in the photos. Mr. Siefert stated that median cuts prevent narrowing. Also, the median is not really that wide; the median in the photos is exaggerated. Angela Dye stated that this project needs to be funded, and it's often a misnomer that this area does not need funding. Can the match for this project perhaps be increased to show more local support? Why wasn't this project funded last year? Dawn Coomer noted that this project was not funded last year since the incorporation with the bridge at 25th Street was not well explained, and that the higher priority project for Phoenix last year was the Tovrea Castle project.

Mesa: Eureka Canal Multi-Use Path (8th Street to Mountain View Dr.)

Dawn Coomer provided a summary of comments on the project, including:

- A city council resolution and support letter will be needed before the application is submitted to ADOT (due to MAG 8/30).
- Has a use agreement with SRP been secured? (Mentioned this in Item 11D.)
- Mention linkage to other canals in project description, Item 10.

- (Question 10) Will this include neighborhood electric vehicles? Be specific about human motorized handicapped items.
- (Map) Better context map with better indication of project is needed. Existing and proposed cross-sections would be helpful.

Cindy Heard addressed the Working Group. This is the only project submitted by Mesa this year, and is a neighborhood initiated project. This is in an opportunity zone and is just under .5 miles in length. The project is currently a 42 foot alleyway with illegal activity. The project will link to several schools and includes a 10 foot path, lighting, benches and bike detector loops at the three roadways the path crosses. The project will include volunteer labor and donations for landscaping, which is why additional landscaping is not needed in this project. The City is working with SRP to obtain a license agreement.

Mary O'Connor noted that the issue with SRP is critical, and a license agreement will be needed. The application should indicate the volunteer effort for the landscaping and irrigation to explain why it's not included in the project. Also, this is an important element of the project that shows community support. Ms. O'Connor stated that the three roadways are probably not arterials, but collectors or neighborhood streets. This is an important distinction since the crossing treatments for bicyclists and pedestrians are different at arterials and collectors. The applicant should work with the transportation division to determine the type of roadways. Regardless, the application should clearly describe the type of crossing to be used to assure the safety of path users.

Angela Dye stated that the destinations in the area should be shown on the map in the appendix. The state committee will need to understand why this link is a critical element in the transportation system. Ms. Dye added that landscaping is an important element that is needed in multi-use path projects. The neighborhood contribution in providing volunteer efforts and the donated landscaping should be noted.

Valley Metro/RPTA: Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety Program

Dawn Coomer described the project and noted some issues. The application was also submitted last year, at a higher cost. Major issues raised last year have been addressed in this year's application. Also, a Board resolution and letter of support will be needed prior to submitting the application to ADOT (due to MAG 8/30). Other comments included some confusion over terminology used in the application, the benefits of the program, the major goals of the program, and the long-term benefits of the program.

Priscilla Hanrahan addressed the committee and distributed a hand-out which summarizes the program. The program is a "Kids Walk to School" community event and information materials. Walking to school helps children and parents to think of walking as both a form of exercise and transportation. The goals of the program are to increase awareness to the importance of regular physical activity and to improve pedestrian safety. Encouraging walking also benefits air quality and relieves traffic congestion. The program includes a pre-awareness campaign poster contest, designing a kit to distribute to schools, and promotion of the event. The day will be held in

October, 2003. City police and fire departments, and employers who participate in the Trip Reduction Program will be contacted as partners for the program.

Co-Chair Hutchinson asked if the program was new. Ms. Hanarahan stated that the program is new. Some cities do have programs already, and Valley Metro/RPTA is looking at national campaigns to see how to best implement the program. Co-Chair Hutchinson asked how many schools are participating. Ms. Hanarahan noted that the exact number will depend on whether they wish to be involved. Valley Metro/RPTA will work with city staff to identify schools.

Angela Dye noted that a report had just been completed for Glendale which noted that developing safe routes to schools is very important. In the entire program, school districts can be a weak link. There may not be enough staff resources in this project. A major issue is that school administrators and teachers have too much vying for their attention, and it can be difficult to keep this issue a priority. The best solution is for neighborhoods to have liaisons to work with schools. While this program may be a good start, it probably won't make a big enough difference to be significant. A more comprehensive effort is needed.

Andre Licardi noted that it can be difficult to reach to the correct contact person in schools. The proposed program should include working with parent groups. Materials should be developed that allow teachers to use them again and again, and be useful for longer time periods.

Mary O'Connor added that support from the School District Board is critical implementing a program like this. In addition, spending one-half of the budget on advertising is too much. The budget needs to be examined. The budget should be re-focused on materials development. Also, staff support is needed to go out and speak to schools and parents groups. Parent groups are a better audience than general advertising.

Reed Kempton stated that there are many general statements in the application that are not appropriate. For example, question 16 states that "society promotes driving" and question 18 discusses how parents working outside the home is a "disturbing trend." These types of statements should be removed from the application or supported with some factual statistics.

Doug Kupel noted that the "neighborhood integrity" statement in question 21 is a bit disturbing as well. In addition, the hand-out provided today is better at explaining the program than the application. The program seems good and is needed. The application must show how this program is a solution to a particular problem. The problems should be more apparent in the application.

Tempe: 13th Street Pedestrian and Bikeway Improvements, Landscape and Artist Designed Elements

Dawn Coomer explained the project and noted that it had been submitted several times before. A Council resolution will be needed prior to submitting the application to ADOT (due to MAG 8/30). Tempe may wish to indicate the priority of the 2 projects submitted for the information of

the Enhancement Funds Working Group. There was also some confusion about the length of the project in the application – is it 1 ¼ or ¾ miles? A reviewer was curious to know if the utility company was supportive of the undergrounding, and if bus pull-outs would be needed in the project. A reviewer liked the art element.

Gary Davis addressed the Working Group. He stated that 13th Street is currently used as a cut-through route in Tempe. The entire area is 1 ¼ miles, but this phase of the project is ¾ mile from Mill to Hardy. This is the highest priority phase of this project. The project includes a six foot sidewalk, undergrounding utilities, bike lanes and traffic calming elements. Tempe is working with the utility company on the undergrounding, which is part of the local match in this project. There is no transit on this roadway, so bus pull-outs are not needed.

Co-Chair Stanton asked about the status of the CMAQ funding for the project, and Mr. Davis stated that the CMAQ funds will obligate in August of this year.

Glendale: Gateway Pocket Park Acquisition and Development

Dawn Coomer addressed the Working Group, noting that this project had been submitted before and has been improved from prior submittals. She suggested that the project would fare better in the enhancement program as a “bicycle/pedestrian rest area” instead of a “pocket park.” She added that a Council resolution is forthcoming (placed on the June agenda), and that the resolution will be needed before the application is submitted to ADOT (due to MAG 8/30). She asked if Glendale wanted to indicate the priority of the two projects submitted. A reviewer suggested that restrooms would improve the project.

Paula Moloff addressed the Working Group. She explained that the project was an abandoned Mobile site and was their highest priority project. The city is working to purchase the property and will also be building a bus bay with local funds near the project site. An underpass is also being completed at 43rd Avenue and Peoria with CMAQ funding, and with Phoenix as a partner. This project will be a rest area for users of the numerous paths and trails nearby, and will link with those trails systems. The project will include landscaping, extensive seeding, a water feature, and shade. Three of four corners at the intersection have commercial development, and the project is near transit.

Councilmember Tom Eggleston addressed the Working Group. He noted that this area has been an eyesore in the community for quite some time, and that this project was needed in the area. The project will greatly improve the appearance of the intersection and also improve the safety of users. There is substantial investment at the local level since the property has already been purchased and a bus bay will be provided with local funds. Councilmember Eggleston hoped that the Working Group would consider a high recommendation for this project.

Mary O'Connor noted that the application has been improved from prior years. This project should be called a “rest area.” In addition, the substantial local investment in the project should be added to the application. This information is important for reviewers of the application to

know. Ms. O'Connor asked if this rest area could only be accessed from 43rd Avenue, or if the nearby paths intersect the proposed rest area?

Ms. Moloff noted that the rest area will be designed when the underpass is completed. The intention of the rest area is to intersect with the nearby paths and trails. Ms. O'Connor stated that the application should show how all multi-modal paths will integrate with the rest area. In addition, there are some design issues to consider to meet ADA guidelines. Hardscape will be needed for wheelchair users near the seating wall. Ms. Moloff noted that the design in the application packet is not final, and that the graphic is only illustrative. Ms. O'Connor added that paver stones should not be in the final design and that a clear zone is needed to meet ADA guidelines. Also, the graphic does not clearly show how wheelchair users will enter from the sidewalk. Ms. Moloff explained that the rest area will be integrated with the transit stop, and that ADA users will be able to use the rest area by accessing it from the transit stop.

Angela Dye stated that the aerial photo is particularly helpful and will be good for the state committee. She added that the tree pattern in the conceptual design could be simplified to better show the project. Ms. Dye asked if there were any hazardous materials issues, and that the application should mention that these are either resolved or will be resolved. Ms. Moloff stated that the file is currently being closed with the ADEQ and the tanks have been removed.

Reed Kempton asked where the underpass was at 43rd Avenue and Peoria. The rest area should be linked to the nearby paths. The underpass should be shown on the map in the appendix.

Glendale: Multi-Use Bridge at 71st Avenue Wash

Ms. Moloff explained that this project crosses 71st Avenue wash just north of Bell Road. The bridge will connect two trail segments, which eventually link to the Paseo and on into Phoenix. The bridge is 10 feet wide and 120 feet long. This will create a crossing much safer than Bell Road, and will provide access to commercial and medical destinations.

Angela Dye noted that the aerial map in the appendix should include some roadway names for those on the state committee who may not be familiar with the area. The project location should also be clearly shown on the map.

Chandler: Bicycle Lanes on SR 87 (Arizona Avenue) south of Ocotillo Rd. to Hunt Hwy.

Dawn Coomer summarized some of the issues with this project. A Council resolution and support letter from the City will be obtained before the application is submitted to ADOT (due to MAG 8/30). In addition, the applicant is working to obtain a district engineer signature and support letter. Also, does the project link to a planned County bike lane? Other issues include:

- (Question 9) Does it meet the criteria for Category 2? Should just be for category 1.
- (Question 10) What standards are being used, i.e., AASHTO?
- (Question 19) Do you have any safety statistics (crash rates, etc.) to help the application?

- (Question 19) Will this project include signage? May help safety argument to include some signage.

Mike Normand addressed the Working Group. The project will pave three miles of shoulder from Ocotillo to the city limits. The road is currently in a milled condition which is very dangerous for cyclists. The bicycle lane will connect to a multi-use path along the Consolidated Canal. The project will use Chandler standards, which are based on AASHTO. Accident statistics are being prepared for the application.

Mary O'Connor noted that the project should be five to six feet in width, and that the application should clarify the width of the bicycle lane. Also, the map doesn't show a direct connection to the Consolidated Canal Paseo – is this an error? Mr. Normand stated that the lane does connect, but he would verify this information. Ms. O'Connor said that the missing connection to the Paseo appeared to be very small on the map, and that completing this connection would be an important element of this project.

Reed Kempton stated that ADOT had milled the roadway in 1983, and that it was smooth prior to their work. Co-Chair Stanton asked about the ranking of the applications. Greg Westrum responded that no ranking was available, and he was not sure if the ranking would be provided to the EFWG.

Chandler: Phase II Pedestrian Lighting Project for Historic Downtown Chandler

Mike Normand addressed the Working Group. The current pedestrian lighting in the area is not adequate. The lighting being proposed will be similar to the lighting installed in Phase 1 of the project. Mr. Normand stated that the City is checking with SHPO to make sure the improvements are acceptable.

Doug Kupel stated that an initial contact with SHPO probably occurred in Phase I, and that person may be helpful in this phase as well. He added that a description of Phase I in the application would be very helpful in understanding this project. He also noted that the maps in the appendix could be combined to help clearly define the project and show where the lights will be placed.

Mary O'Connor noted that there is a difference between pedestrian lighting and street lights. The word "street" should be removed if these are truly pedestrian-scaled lights. Are these lights overhead? What type of lights will be provided? Will the lights be placed in the public right-of-way? Angela Dye asked if the lights would meet "dark sky" standards, which apply to the entire state of Arizona.

Chandler: Relocation of An Historical Air Force F-86 Static Display Aircraft

Dawn Coomer noted that this project may not be eligible for enhancement funds. Greg Westrum explained that the aircraft relates to airmen who traveled along Williams Field Road. There is significant history to this location. The proposed relocation will be close to the Paseo Trail, which

creates a link to transportation. A manager letter of support will be handed in today to MAG staff.

Co-Chair Hutchinson asked if there was private funding for the project, and Mr. Westrum stated that the project is currently maintained privately. However, there is still a need to relocate the plane.

Angela Dye asked for clarification of the \$50,000 for landscape establishment, which seemed fairly high. Also, the number for relocation and mechanical seems high and should be explained. This seems like a lot of money to relocate a plane. Mr. Westrum stated that some sort of moveable base and display would be part of the project.

Mary O'Connor stated that the project may not be eligible since it is a mitigation. The relocation alone may not be sufficient to qualify for enhancements. Enhancements must go "above and beyond" what is typically done. Also, does the relocation destroy the historic context?

Reed Kempton added that the airplane was a landmark along the roadway when traveling from Eloy to Phoenix prior to the construction of urban freeways. Doug Kupel stated that mitigation appears to be at the heart of this project. The project will need to go above and beyond mitigation. Is the resource eligible for the National Historic Register? To be eligible for historic preservation, the resource must either be listed or eligible. Also, the applicant should decide how to approach this project. Either the resource is historic, or take the approach that it's beyond mitigation of widening the roadway.

Gilbert: Canal Crossing Project

Dawn Coomer provided a brief summary of the application. A Council resolution will be needed (in addition to the support letter from the Mayor) before the project is submitted to ADOT (due to MAG 8/30). Will SRP allow these bridges? Photos in the appendix clearly demonstrate the need for the bridges. In addition, a signature original is needed.

Tami Ryall addressed the Working Group. The project will fund 4 bridges across canals and are similar to bridges already used in Gilbert. SRP is in full support of the bridges. Ms. Ryall referred to the photos in the project application to demonstrate some of the issues in the areas where the bridges will be placed. For example, connections to neighborhoods are required to provide access to trails in Gilbert. These bridges connect to a much larger planned and funded system of trails in the East Valley. Some citizens make their own crossings which are very unsafe for users. These bridges will improve safety.

Mary O'Connor noted that the application is well-written and comprehensive. Are the bridges 15 or 16 feet? This should be included in the application. Indicate that the bridges meet AASHTO guidelines, rather than being designed by AASHTO. There is a photo with a bollard in the middle of the path, which may negatively impact accessibility – the reason for this bollard should be

clarified. Ms. Ryall indicated that the bollard is probably there to prevent cars from using the path. In addition, all suggestions will be incorporated into the application.

Maricopa County: Gillespie Dam Bridge Restoration Project

Dawn Coomer provided a summary of the project, which is a bridge restoration that is eligible for enhancement funds. While question 19 does note that the sensors will not damage the historic integrity of the bridge, it is not apparent if SHPO will allow the sensors to be added to the bridge. In addition, a letter of support and Board resolution will be needed before the application is submitted to ADOT (Due to MAG 8/30). The photos in the appendix were very helpful as well.

Dora Vasquez addressed the Working Group. Ms. Vasquez provided a summary of the project and explained that the bridge is currently used by cycling groups and is near a wildlife refuge area. The bridge has historic significance and needs to be restored. The bridge is currently too narrow for trucks. A new map has been prepared for the application. The project includes the addition of a sidewalk. The bridge will be changed to allow one-way traffic, which will increase the safety for bicyclists.

Angela Dye noted that the \$355,000 cost estimate needed to be explained and divided into smaller components to provide an understanding of what will be provided. Doug Kupel voiced his support for the application, and noted that the bridge is linked to the historic development of Route 80. Question 19 should note that the design is substandard by today's standards – but was designed very well for when it was constructed. Mary O'Connor added that the text of the application should be modified to add that traffic will be one-way on the bridge.

Phoenix: Grand Canal to Steele Indian School Park Pathway

Dawn Coomer provided a summary of issues for this project. Phoenix has provided a council resolution supporting this as their 2nd highest priority of two projects submitted. The project description (question 10) should note that a support letter from the Phoenix Union High School District is in the appendix. Also, the multi-use pathway cost estimate seems too low.

Tom Fitzgerald addressed the Working Group. This project will link a regional route to a park. He noted that a conceptual design is provided in the project application. The multi-use path will be a minimum of 10 feet wide. Safety will be enhanced by removal of landscaping that encroaches on the pedestrian travel way. An agreement with the school exists for a 25 foot easement. There will be better landscaping and a buffered sidewalk.

Angela Dye noted that not enough landscaping is provided, and that shade is needed for pedestrians. Chris Ewell explained that the landscaping will complement the existing landscape pattern in the area. Ms. Dye emphasized that more landscaping is needed to provide shade for pedestrians. Mr. Fitzgerald added that palm trees are also in the area, which are not shown in the graphics.

Mary O'Connor asked if sidewalk was being eliminated in some portion. To be considered a multi-use path, there must be 10 feet in width. Is there a 10 foot path or a five foot sidewalk? Mr. Ewell noted that most areas will be 10 feet wide. Ms. O'Connor added that the photos are very helpful, but reveal some other problems that should be addressed in this project. In the 3rd photo, the ramps aren't accessible. Will the barrier curb be eliminated? In the 4th photo, a level landing is needed to meet ADA on the back of the curb ramp. Ms. O'Connor suggested that the applicant work with the Street Department to identify what is needed to meet ADA. Mr. Ewell responded that these problems can be addressed, and that the Street Department manages all of these types of projects.

Tempe: Country Club Way Bicycle/ Pedestrian Bridge and Multi-Use Paths

Dawn Coomer provided some information on issues for this project. The project has been submitted before. Last year, the state committee was concerned that this was a "mitigation project," and that concern has been addressed. The cost estimate clearly identifies different components of project. A Council Resolution and letter of support from the City will be needed before the application is submitted to ADOT (due to MAG 8/30). In addition, the application must be signed by the ADOT district engineer and have a district engineer support letter before being submitted to ADOT (due to MAG 8/30). Finally, ADOT may not consider this a state application, since much of the right-of-way is owned by Tempe. Other reviewers were concerned about some of the safety information in question 18.

Eric Iwersen addressed the Working Group. The project is more than just a mitigation of the freeway widening. Ramps are included, as well as lighting, safety and aesthetic components. The project links two parks and two schools – two neighborhoods. A critical gap in the existing non-motorized transportation system would be eliminated with this project. The project meets AASHTO and meets or exceeds ADA guidelines. This project is neighborhood-based.

Mary O'Connor requested that the application be changed in question 18. Some of the information is probably outdated when prior concepts were still being considered. Marcie Ellis expressed strong support for the art element in the project, noting that all enhancement projects need to have art elements included. In general, many of this year's applications lack creativity.

Guadalupe: Guadalupe Road -- I-10 Right-of-Way to Tempe City Limits

Dawn Coomer noted there were several concerns that have already been provided to the applicant. The evaluation category should be indicated in Question 9 (Category 1). It will be important to strike "equestrian" from the application. Use "shared use" or "multi use" instead. Note that the "equestrian bridge" is a "multi use bridge." In addition, the project application should explain how the project will be coordinated with the CMAQ funded project in FY 2005. The cost estimate should indicate which portions of the project are funded with CMAQ, which are funded locally, and which are the subject of this TE application, in a manner similar to the Tempe US 60 Bridge application. There are also numerous questions about the exhibit in the appendix. The exhibit shows a 16' pathway, and the cost estimate uses 10'. There is an ADA concern with the use of

brick pavers. There is currently no 10' center turn lane on the bridge. The plan view is inconsistent with the cross section. The multi-use path and sidewalk should be buffered from the travel lanes. Make sidewalk a minimum of 5' wide, preferably 6' wide.

Antonio Figueroa addressed the Working Group. The application will be corrected to describe this project as a multi-use path, and ADA concerns will be addressed. The Town desires a 16 foot path, and there is sufficient right-of-way. There will also be a six foot sidewalk. The graphics will also be revised to address the comments already noted.

Reed Kempton stated that the bridge section should also be updated in the graphics. The bridge is 28 feet wide, with a four foot stripped shoulder. Also, a two-way path multi-use path on one side of the roadway can create safety issues at intersections and driveways. Mr. Figueroa noted that all cross streets have stop signs, and that the Town speed limit is 25 miles per hour. Mr. Kempton added that the addition of bicycle lanes is a good idea in this area. Marcie Ellis voiced support for the entry monument. Mr. Figueroa asked how the cost estimate should be changed. Ms. Coomer recommended following the Tempe example, and, with Ms. O'Connor nodding approval, stated that this information could be faxed after the meeting.

Ms. O'Connor noted that in the cross-sections, the sidewalk on the north side should be widened to at least five or six feet. Also, the five foot bike lane should be exclusive of curb and gutter. Mr. Figueroa noted that a 100 foot right-of-way was available, so making these changes would be possible. Guadalupe is a pedestrian-oriented community, and the Town wants this to be a great project. Mr. Kempton added that the ADOT bridge across I-10 at Guadalupe is 32 feet, face to face.

Cave Creek: Town Core Handicapped Accessible Non-Motorized Transportation System

Dawn Coomer noted that this project will provide a 1.5 mile path system through the Town of Cave Creek. Some description of the photos in the appendix would be helpful. The bicycle and pedestrian committees liked the high local match and aesthetics of this project.

Glen Fahringer addressed the Working Group, noting that there is presently no sidewalk or pedestrian system. There is not sufficient right-of-way to widen Cave Creek Road. So, the Town will use an existing utility easement to create a non-motorized transportation system that links the Town. The path will be 10 feet wide. Since there is already extensive landscaping in the area, no additional landscaping will be needed. The path will be incorporated into existing parking areas and will benefit local businesses. Mr. Fahringer asked if responses to comments could be sent via e-mail, and Ms. Coomer said they could. Also, can a powerpoint be used for the next meeting? Ms. Coomer responded that a presentation cannot be given at the next meeting, but that photos in the appendix could be updated if needed.

Mike Nunan, a business owner, addressed the Working Group. He is establishing a free bike sharing program for the area, and voiced support for the project. Andrew Dear, a local artist and business owner, noted that this project will create a model for other communities and provide alternatives to driving. Mr. Fahringer added that Mr. Dear's property is near the proposed path.

Mary O'Connor noted several accessibility issues to be addressed in the design of the project. Ms. O'Connor suggested the applicant consult the FHWA resource titled "Designing Sidewalks and Trails for Access." Ms. O'Connor added that decomposed granite should be on the edges of the surface rather than the entire surface so that the majority of the travel way is smooth. In addition, the meander in the path should be required for terrain purposes since it makes the trip longer for some users who may be unable to make a longer trip. Also, the application should note that this is a primary route for destinations for wheelchair users. The destinations should be linked to the pathway. However, use the term "non-motorized transportation system" rather than "handicapped." accessible." Use the term "persons with disabilities" rather than "handicapped."

Ms. O'Connor added that with at 20 foot easement, a wider path can be provided. Make it at least 12 feet if possible. This may require phasing of the project since costs will increase. This path will definitely receive a lot of use. In addition, slope and ramp issues will need to be addressed to meet ADA guidelines. Mr. Fahringer responded that slope issues are only problematic on the east end of the path.

Mr. Kempton stated that a two-way multi-use path next to a roadway will need to address crossing issues. Also, the path should be much wider to allow rollerbladers sufficient room.

Doug Kupel noted that support letters could be improved by adding some letters from business owners who spoke at today's meeting. Mr. Fahringer responded that the existing support letter is from a property owner with substantial holdings near the proposed path.

Marcie Ellis added that some artistic elements should be included in this project.

Peoria: Greenway Channel/Community Park Multi-Use Path and Pedestrian Bridges

Dawn Coomer addressed the Working Group. She explained that the requested amount of federal funds cannot exceed \$500,000 for local applications. Question 11 makes good note of the existing IGA with Flood Control District (land owner). A signature on the original application is needed, and a letter of support and Council Resolution will be needed before the application is submitted to ADOT (due to MAG 8/30). The location map could show how the planned trails will link to the neighborhoods (maybe there are existing trails) and area schools. The bicycle and pedestrian committees thought the match could be raised, that the map could be improved and that the project had regional impact since it is near the Sun Circle Trail

Kirk Haines addressed the Working Group. A new map was distributed to Working Group members. Mr. Haines explained this project is an excellent partnership opportunity between Peoria, the state and the Flood Control District. This is also part of a much larger West Valley Rivers project. The project has three main goals. First, the project will provide linkages to retail, shopping, the Sports Complex, schools and parks. Second, the project will reduce trips by private automobile by providing an alternative transportation network. Bell Road has extensive traffic, and the application will be revised to include traffic counts on nearby roadways. The third goal is to remove barriers. This project will close a missing link along Skunk Creek and the AC/DC Canal. Other trails are planned in the area as well.

Angela Dye suggested that the map be changed to show the links to a larger trail system, and the portion of trail already funded by the state committee. Mary O'Connor asked for the width of the paths and bridges, and noted these should be added on the application. There is a typo in question 11 where the word "bridge" is omitted. The pedestrian lighting is referred to in the cost estimate, but not in the text.

Ms. O'Connor noted that the project will have to be downsized, or perhaps phased into two projects. Mr. Haines stated that Peoria will need to decide whether to phase this project or increase its local share contribution. Ms. O'Connor suggested that the project could be divided into paths and bridges. The bridges could always be added later.

Marcie Ellis stated that using an artist as part of the bridge building is a good idea. Mr. Haines noted that public art is typically included in all parks projects in Peoria. Reed Kempton suggested using a different photo on the front of the application. He added that the regional scope of the project could be expanded by noting the project will also be a part of the Maricopa County Trails Plan. Doug Kupel stated that a regional map is needed of the project that clearly identifies roadways for those who may be unfamiliar with the area. Mr. Kupel added that the screening criteria page also needs to be completed.

Scottsdale: Arizona Transportation Museum/Old Town Scottsdale

Dawn Coomer noted that this application is eligible for transportation enhancements as a transportation museum. She stated that the application includes much discussion of the overall project, but does not specify what these funds will be used for. What types of artifacts? What is their historic value? Reviewers may also want an understanding of how other elements of the project are funded.

Mary O'Connor voiced agreement with the staff comments. Doug Kupel said that this would be a car racing museum, since the association does not focus on transportation, but racing. The link to transportation needs to be stronger. Is this project eligible, given our knowledge of the association and its activities?

Ms. O'Connor asked if there was sufficient support for the application. No one from the City of Scottsdale or the museum is present. Ms. Coomer noted that only Scottsdale was contacted about the meeting since they are the primary contact. Ms. O'Connor added that a support letter is missing from the application. Reed Kempton suggested that the museum could focus on transportation rather than race cars, or that elements funded be more closely linked to the transportation purpose of these funds.

6. Other Items Relevant to the Round X and Future Enhancement Fund Applications

Marcie Ellis noted that a meeting with ADOT was needed to discuss how public art can be incorporated into all enhancement projects. Enhancement projects need to include visual and aesthetic components to make them true enhancements for the community.

7. Future Meeting Dates

The next meeting of the Enhancement Funds Working Group will be held **Monday, June 10, 2001 at 1:30 p.m.** at the MAG office. The purpose of this meeting will be to rank enhancement fund applications.

If necessary, a **tentative meeting** has been scheduled for **Monday, June 24, 2001 at 1:30 p.m.**

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.